

# Port Orford Free Press

Vol. 1 Number 2 – Saturday, April 19, 2014  
*A Publication of Citizens For A Free Port Orford*

## **Thank You Port Orford**

I would like to thank the brave citizens who dared to stand up to the establishment. This trait has been handed down to us by our forefathers, who without, we would be void of our great Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Democratic process. BRAVO!

I would also like to congratulate Mayor Auburn for retaining his position. With that said, you've heard a very strong message from the community. You should not view this in any fashion as an actual approval rating, nor mistake this as an acceptance of the status quo. We the people expect more. More transparency, more honesty, and true representation of ALL citizens you serve.

To the many who have asked me to re-petition immediately, I urge patience, and forgiveness, but also vigilance. Our Mayor has many wonderful qualities. I'm certain he was embarrassed by the inflammatory language, and personal attacks levied against our grass roots opposition. I am optimistic with regards to our mayors ability to understand the message we've sent. We are watching closer than ever, with the understanding this style of governance will change. Without change, we could, and should expect another recall effort. Its our duty as citizens. Some have said recalls are too expensive. I strongly urge those people relay that message to city hall by demanding change as well.

Please continue to follow my informational letters in the Port Orford News, and Port Orford Free Press, as I will continue to share my understanding and opinion of critically important issues facing our community such as the National Marine Sanctuary, Charter Government, VMEC, and our failing water infrastructure. Stay tuned and stay strong.

Thankfully, Brett Webb

## **For the record:**

- D. Ames

Since some folks around town have a habit of twisting things about with little truth remaining when they arrive to the next person; I am going to set the record straight.

1. I said, I and others witnessed and heard the content of a meeting and mentioned only a few who were present in the meeting at said meeting at the top of the trail head by the Battle Rock sign. This meeting was also

videoed and I am in possession of the video.

2. The mayor confirmed what I had heard when he stated: *"the Hawthorne's have been good to us"* to justify why he was considering this move. This has been videoed and placed online at archive.org

3. My contention has always been with the mayor giving away city land and I have never stated otherwise or said the receiver of the gift was a thief. If others view it differently, then that's their opinion.

I love it here and no one is running me off with threats that they can't substantiate; there are 214 minds to change and 203 people willing to change those minds. We don't throw mud, we don't call people names, we don't mock others---we tell the truth and we support the truth with evidence.

## **Why NO to N.M.S**

- Brett Webb

I fully expect a concerted back-lashing from P.O.O.R.T. I suppose you will hear everything except "We strongly oppose a National Marine Sanctuary." I suggest one listen closely for the lisp of a forked tongue. Remember, these are the people working with our mayor, secretly, to pursue an agenda that benefits them. A project pursued unlike the Red Fish Rocks Marine Reserve, which I personally participated in start to finish. A process that was transparent. One that contained substantial industry, political, and community input. The sanctuary process has been shrouded in mystery, and thick with deceit.

Some have said I have shouted louder and louder. None of those people have asked me why I strongly oppose a Sanctuary in our precious local waters. I do support science, conservation, and responsible use.

The following is the framework on which my objection was built. Remember the following basics, as I will build upon them in the future.

The United States Congress must make essential changes and/or clarifications to the National Marine Sanctuary Act and/or the Magnuson Stevenson Fishery Conservation and Management Act before I could begin to support such a device. These changes must include, but are not limited to the

following issues.

1) Congress must enforce the requirement that Sanctuary Management fully comply with the Freedom of Information Act in entirety, and do so in a timely fashion. Recent delayed, and highly debated documents show William Douros' desire to, "Trick fisherman." (his words) Mr Douros is the West Coast Sanctuaries Regional Director, and would be the director above a manager at Cape Blanco. An immediate climate of distrust is inevitable, when language such as this is used by such a powerful person.

2) Require the Sanctuary Program to use proven, peer reviewed science in Management decisions. Currently, Sanctuaries have no form of scientific and statistical standards or committees. Nor are they required to use the best available data or science in decision making. With that said many science products used appear as blatant advocacy pieces which should require an independent peer review.

3) It is clear from the history and evolution of the National Marine Sanctuary Act that Congress intends the program to balance resource protection with multiple use opportunities. Apparent to most people who investigate,, this is not the value of the current program, that obviously tilts heavily towards preservation rather than conservation. Congress should clearly specify and enforce it's intent.

4) The National Marine Sanctuary Program must recognize and accept the Magnuson Act as the dominate statute for all fishing related management issues. Including creation of Marine Protected Areas within sanctuaries. Marine Protected Areas have time and time again been used to close vast areas to fishing within sanctuaries. The current language of the Sanctuary Act has been understood by managers as a green light to override Regional Fishery Management Councils. Add to this repeated statements from Sanctuary leaders that their mandate is "Resource Protection." Resulting in further distrust among fishermen and other resource users. Congress must address this

confusion.

5) Of utmost importance is the issue of local control, or as in the Sanctuary case, lack thereof. The current public voice is heard through Sanctuary Advisory Councils (SAC). The SAC is hand chosen by Sanctuary Management. While appearing to be the local voice, Management may, and have staffed these councils with persons sharing the Management's goals. Management also controls the agenda of SAC meetings. Shockingly, the SAC members are not permitted to communicate any concerns outside the Sanctuary Program without prior permission from Sanctuary Management. Furthermore, Management may ignore SAC input all together. The Sac is controlled to benefit the preservationist goals of Sanctuary Management, not to represent the goals of the community.

Lastly, program managers view Sanctuary resources as "National Resources" because they become such. The last nail in the local control coffin is driven. Literally, a man in New York City has the same ownership, and voice as a lifelong Port Orford fisherman. This framework represents the tip of the iceberg in regards to my opposition of a National Marine Sanctuary designation in our regions coastal area. An area that my family and friends cherish beyond words.

#### **City Council Meeting**

- staff reporter

The city council met Thursday in the council chambers at 3:30PM. All councilors and the mayor were in attendance, as well as the city attorney along with several citizens in the audience. The mayor's agenda was quickly modified as both councilors MacLeod and Pogwizd added councilor supported resolutions officially opposing the National Marine Sanctuary (NMS) and the county measure 8-76 respectively.

During Citizens Concerns: Toby Porter discussed the proposed 'flea market' to be held every 3rd Saturday closing 15th Street in cooperation with Ray's Food, vendor space available at \$10. Tim Leslie mentioned his research on a sound/noise ordinance – which was not an agenda item. Brett Webb asked why Tyson Rasor was automatically reappointed without adequate advertisement to the citizens at large, and what specifically qualifies him to be on this committee? Tyler Long delivered a letter from the Oregon Dungeness Crab Commission with concerns that a NMS will adversely affect the fishery and therefore opposes establishing a NMS here. County Commissioner David Smith presented

a white paper from County District Attorney Everett Dial pointing to several flaws in the proposed county charter measure 8-76, concluding “the Charter will transfer supervisor authority away from elected officials and vest that authority in an appointed official.”

A brief presentation to the council was made by John Hitt of South Coast Development Council (SCDC). They do economic development with their current focus on “Products sold outside the South Coast area.” Finding new markets and helping new businesses with site planning are also areas they work in. They are currently only in talks with Port Orford Sustainable Seafood, but it seems that because all our fish goes elsewhere, anyone involved with fishing is eligible.

Terrie Richards gave the Administrators and Public Works reports. Councilor Clancy asked what effort was being made to procure grants for the repair of our water system. Terrie stated that she does ongoing weekly searches for new available grants – apparently with little success so far. Councilor Pogwizd mentioned applications were being accepted for the new part-time public works position.

Councilor Clancy then asked during the Finance report about the PERS situation with our current police officers. It appears at first blush that we in fact have a repeat of the same outstanding PERS obligation down the road. Terrie stated that she has received an email from a PERS employee that “we are not at risk”. David Johnson said he had reviewed and verified this was true. However, no signed document from PERS with this guarantee was provided at this time.

The police chief introduced the newest member of the force – Chris Hansen formerly police chief of Butte Falls, Oregon. Councilor MacLeod reported about the Robotics Project at the High School. Councilor Billings reported the restoration of the trails at Battle Rock City Park is in progress, and that the Parks Commission is looking for one more commissioner. County Commissioner Smith stated the county will not enact a Marijuana dispensary moratorium, but expect forthcoming regulations for time, place, etc. Also the Pacific Gales Golf appeal has been extended to May 22.

Old Business – The resolution added earlier by Councilor MacLeod to oppose the NMS was passed 4/2 with McArdle and Dianne voting NO. In addition, before the vote, Dianne labored on at length for a good 10 minutes about minutia in the resolution document – minor spelling errors, punctuation details, etc. It was very unprofessional and simply wasted time.

New Business – Councilor MacLeod made a motion to close 15<sup>th</sup> Street between Ray's and the library every 3<sup>rd</sup> Saturday for a public Flea Market, motion passed 6/o. Councilor Clancy made a motion to accept the OLCC Alcohol Renewal, motion passed 6/o. Councilor Pogwizd made a motion for a resolution to officially oppose Curry County Charter Measure 8-76. During the process the mayor suggested to Dianne that she motion to table this motion, whereby Tim immediately called for a vote, the motion passed 4/2, with McArdle and Dianne voting NO.

Consent Calendar – Councilor Clancy again brought out the point that Tyson Rasor should not automatically be reappointed, especially since it was heard that he had, or would be resigning the position. As such, a motion was required, made by Dianne, to reappoint Rasor, the motion passed with Councilors MacLeod and Clancy voting against it.

In continuing actions, a burn ordinance is being loosely discussed.

A public hearing was held for the Marijuana Dispensary Moratorium Ordinance, temporarily banning dispensaries within the city limits until May 1, 2015, or sooner if rescinded. Councilor Pogwizd made the motion, which passed 5/1, with Dianne voting NO.

Citizens concerns – Chris Reid reminded us of the League of Women Voters forum on measure 8-76 Tuesday 4/22 at 7PM, city hall.

Mayors concerns – stated that he fully backs the charter measure with the justification as “its simpler, and things”. He then complained at length about the short notice and lack of transparency of the two resolutions added by the councilors. This from a man who has repeatedly given short or no notice to the councilors during his term in office, with one of the best examples being the addition of a Right of Way use request from a certain developer at Battle Rock City Park to the Consent Calendar of the 12/18/2008 council meeting. No prior notice was given, it was added by the mayor to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting. City Councilor (at the time) David Brock Smith made the motion to accept it, and it was passed.

**Don't forget, a video of this meeting as well as for those over the last several years is on-line free for you to view at:**

**[www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org)**

#### **Notice**

All submissions to the *Port Orford Free Press* must be made by email, in text only format – all other forms will be rejected.

**Email submissions to:**

**[PortOrfordFreePress@gmail.com](mailto:PortOrfordFreePress@gmail.com)**